



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,433	10/31/2003	Thomas Arend	08516.0005	7747

22852 7590 08/03/2007
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

COUGHLAN, PETER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2129

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/697,433	Applicant(s) AREND, THOMAS	
	Examiner Peter Coughlan	Art Unit 2129	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Coughlan.

(3) Mr. Patel.

(2) Mr. Joe Hirl.

(4) Mr. Lombardi.

Date of Interview: 02 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: 'Semantic mediation for cooperative spatial information systems: the AMUN data model'.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interview followed the interview agenda.

Concerning all the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections, all were made under 'written description' and not 'enablement' as stated by the Applicant.

Concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 regarding the grouping of sets which are 'semantically grouped' the Examiner is willing to consider withdrawing this rejection.

Concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 regarding the solutions being represented in 'sequential order', 'hierarchical order' and 'dynamically adaptive order' the Examiner is willing to withdraw the rejection of 'sequential order' portion of this rejection. However the conversation with Mr. Patel and Mr. Lombardi failed to convince the Examiner how 'hierarchical order' and 'dynamically adaptive order' are achieved. No mention of an algorithm, system, method described how this is accomplished.

Concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 concerning the claim language 'returns solutions that solve the problem indirectly by further knowledge representations for further inference module' was not talked about.

Concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 concerning what type of 'expert system' was to be employed was not talked about.

Concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 the Applicant stated that since the claims were stated as a 'system', there was no need to disclose a practical application. The Examiner disagrees.

The data of the reference was clarified. .